

NEW JERSEY

Elva B. Feller, Fayson Lakes.
Stephen M. Vahaly, Port Reading.
Clifford L. Cardozo, Scotch Plains.

NEW YORK

Henry S. Salfi, Accord.
Charles L. Messer, Auburn.
Dorothy A. White, Bloomingdale.
Donald L. Phelps, Burdett.
Theodore O. Gramm, Campbell Hall.
Theodore H. Sheldon, Fort Montgomery.
Leigh R. Jones, Franklinville.
Elodine S. Baxter, Hinsdale.
Leon E. Youngs, Johnson City.
Lola M. Dauch, Mongaup Valley.
Alta M. De Silva, Mount Tremper.
Donald R. Harvison, Olean.
Ralph E. Ouderik, Jr., Palantine Bridge.
Frank P. Platz, Shandaken.
Walter L. Deutsch, Slate Hill.

OHIO

Clinton C. Dill, Bellville.
Anne F. Day, Glenmont.
Mabel E. Crawford, Holmesville.
Hoy J. Seckinger, Jacksonville.
William D. Griffith, Shawnee.
Henry M. Heyl, Wooster.

OREGON

Maud J. Arnold, Butte Falls.
Clyde W. Carstens, Roseburg.
Cecil W. Wickman, St. Helens.

PENNSYLVANIA

Grandfield White, Cambridge Springs.
Henry C. Schlosser, Gallitzin.
John A. Moore, Gibsonia.
Burdette L. Gelnett, Grampian.
Samuel Edward Resley, Huntingdon.
Russell E. Emlinizer, Lemon.
Albert F. Rusiewicz, Natrona.
Earl S. Thoman, Railroad.
Clarence R. Pfaff, South Heights.
Albert F. Kutzer, Tremont.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert L. Brown, Bradley.
Lloyd W. Malde, Mount Vernon.
Francis A. Degner, Salem.

TENNESSEE

Bill W. Harvey, Kingston.
Hal H. Horner, Morristown.

TEXAS

Elmer C. Boatler, Big Spring.
D. W. Springer, Blooming Grove.
Edgar W. Cowling, Bridgeport.
John H. Reilnicke, Crockett.
Allen A. Keese, Medina.
Arthur T. Ward, Shiner.
James W. Hampton, Smithville.
Dallas V. Farmer, Valley Mills.
Paul P. Berthelot, Victoria.

VIRGINIA

Frayser F. White, Brems Bluff.
Alfred C. Emerson, Dry Fork.
Conrad S. Geler, Sr., McLean.

WISCONSIN

Archibald G. Campbell, Barneveld.
Martin O. Netland, Catawba.
Joseph F. Bowar, Cross Plains.
Louis L. Dinkel, Fox Lake.
Gordon J. Hauser, Hilbert.
Sidney J. Soltysik, Lyndon Station.
Harold L. Trehey, Seneca.

WYOMING

Verba M. Lawrence, Moran.

for this day with its many opportunities for service.

All our yesterdays are a glorious testimony that Thou wilt never withhold from us Thy divine companionship and counsel if we strive to walk uprightly and perform our duties faithfully.

We beseech Thee to manifest Thy presence and favor unto these Thy servants who are giving themselves courageously and devotedly to the high adventure of building a nobler civilization.

Fill us with a sincere and eager longing to preserve and cultivate those moral and spiritual values which are so desperately needed in our efforts to bring peace and blessedness to all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 20, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 975. An act to amend the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended; and

S. 2225. An act relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1815) entitled "An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes."

SHIP CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to initiate a program of constructing 60 cargo and cargo-passenger ships per year to effectuate the policy of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

An immediate ship-construction program is vital to the national defense of our country.

Admiral Leggett, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, told our committee a short time ago that the condition of our commercial shipyards promises to be the most vulnerable area of our whole preparedness program. He did not say that the most vulnerable area promised to be in the lack of battleships, airplanes, tanks, or guns. He emphasized the plight of commercial yards which face closure, and which in an emergency must be called upon to furnish the ships that carry the men and materials to the war fronts.

Just last Thursday the House Armed Services Committee in its report on H. R. 8571 said that our shipbuilding industry is in critical condition, that it is essential to our national security, and that new commercial or Government-sponsored construction is required.

Secretary of Navy Charles S. Thomas told members of our committee that we must start on an immediate program of ship construction.

Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation Robert Murray in his recent comprehensive report recommended a ship construction program of 60 ships per year.

During World War II the Axis powers sank 36 million tons of allied shipping. We are now informed that the Russians have six times as many submarines as did the Germans at the start of World War II. The Navy estimates that the Russians have 350 ready-to-go submarines. Unquestionably they are the high-speed and long-range type which could play havoc with the practically obsolete ships in our lay-up fleet.

Red arms and ammunition presently being shipped to Central America point up the vulnerability of the Panama Canal. Should anything happen to the canal, our need for fast, modern ships to serve both our coasts would be multiplied.

Because of the lack of cargo- and troop-carrying vessels prior to World War II we almost lost the war. The war was prolonged because we did not have enough ships. The consequent cost in men and supplies lost was immeasurable.

We must not make the same mistakes we made in both world wars through neglect of our merchant marine. Let us heed the lessons of the past, and provide for an adequate merchant fleet which our military authorities recognize as our fourth arm of defense.

SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the statement just made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], that he is introducing legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to build 60 merchant ships should interest every Member of the House. Time and again, we have been reminded of the need for an adequate fleet of modern, fast merchant vessels as an adjunct to defense.

Right now, the shipyards of this country are running out of work and our various teams of skilled workers will be dissipated unless we promptly begin a shipbuilding program.

Meanwhile, a great deal of small-boat building has been allocated to foreign shipyards and our naval procurement of combat vessel construction has had to be divided among both public and private yards in order to maintain minimum mobilization facilities.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in whose fellowship our spirits are renewed, we thank Thee

I want to commend the gentleman from Washington for the excellent job he is doing as acting chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. This bill that he is introducing deserves the active support of every Member of this body. Our merchant marine is called our fourth arm of defense. Let us not make the mistake we have made in the past by waiting until a crisis, but rather, as a measure of economy, provide a sustained shipbuilding program during years of peace.

As I told the House last February, the situation that is shocking to my mind is that we have no program in this country of private merchant marine shipbuilding. After the lesson of World War II, it is inconceivable that no provision has been made to insure our security by the building and maintenance of a private fleet of merchant ships.

BRITISH TARIFF RESTRICTIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, when the British loan was up immediately after World War II, the chief argument advanced was that we should loan them money instead of extending credit in order to break down the trade restrictions which the British Empire had. I opposed that loan on the basis that we should make an Export-Import Bank type of loan, where we could see that the benefits of our loans went to the places where we thought they should. I did not believe that trade barriers would be removed and subsequent events have proven how right we were.

I would like to present to the House here a letter under date of April 3, 1954, to show you what the situation now is. This letter from from a farmer in Fosse Bridge, Gloucestershire, England, and it is directed to Mr. M. P. Moore, Circle M Ranch, Senatobia, Miss.

The letter reads:

Dear Mr. Moore: You will remember that we have corresponded in the past regarding Poll Herefords in England, and that I started my herd by AI from CMR Advance Domino 81st.

In a letter of April 27, 1953, you suggested that the best progress would be made by getting in the blood of a Rollo, Larry, or Mixer bull. I and my colleagues are now considering importing a bull from overseas, and I write to you for help and advice.

Unfortunately the regulations of the British Treasury and of the Ministry of Agriculture preclude importation from the U. S. A. and though I have made several overtures to the Ministry, there seems no hope of getting this regulation suspended. They will permit us to import from Australia or New Zealand, however, and also probably from Canada, provided that the bull we wish to import has been bred and reared in Canada. Can you recommend to me any breeder in Canada who might be able to let us have such a bull, preferably of the Larry strain? I would be most grateful for help in this, as I know no breeders in Canada. I am only sorry that the British regulations prevent me coming direct to Circle M Ranch.

Our work is going on in a satisfactory manner, and we are gradually building up our stock. I will feel very happy when I have a herd of nice Poll females. At the moment I cannot afford to cull very much for quality, as I still have to use horned animals. But I am glad to say that even if I had a big enough stock to permit severe culling, I would in most cases be hard put to it to know which not to keep.

Incidentally, in your last letter you say you would put me on the mailing list for your literature, but I have not had anything yet. I would be very grateful if you would send me anything of interest.

Yours very sincerely,

In other words, that is a flat regulation by the British Empire prohibiting the importation of agricultural commodities from the United States of America.

The British loan was made. I cite the foregoing letter for the consideration of our State Department, our various committees now dealing with foreign policy and foreign aid. Certainly we must insist on the ending of such policy as England has here, if further aid is extended.

"GIVE US A CHANCE TO STAY IN THE NAVY"

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is highly unusual, to say the least, when the wives of servicemen feel constrained to petition their husbands' "boss," the Congress of the United States, for a pay increase to help make ends meet.

A group of Navy wives in my district, under the leadership of Mrs. Doris Klies and Mrs. Jenny Starren, have presented the Secretary of the Navy and me with copies of a petition signed by 131 Navy wives, calling for such an increase. I have introduced a cost-of-living pay-raise bill for service personnel, and have a deep interest in legislation that will improve the pay status of our military personnel. For that reason, I include the body of the petition as a part of my remarks:

GIVE US A CHANCE TO STAY IN THE NAVY

When our husbands joined the Navy they felt there was no better career than in the service of their country.

When we married Navy men we accepted the inherent disadvantages of Navy life—frequent moves, long separations, added responsibility a wife must assume, etc. We were proud of our country, and wanted to instill in our children the same love and devotion.

However, we did expect that after 10, 15, 20 years of service our husbands would receive sufficient pay for us to maintain at least a decent standard of living and to give our children a few of the advantages a competent civilian could secure for his children.

Over the past several years, the rising cost of living, plus constant reduction of the benefits we were promised, plus the lack of any real pay raise, has made a Navy career a choice between serving our country and providing for our children. We can no longer do both.

We respectfully request that you do all in your power to secure the pay raise which

is now before Congress, so that more husbands are not forced to make the choice between service to his country and the welfare of his own family.

TIME FOR ACTION IN THE AMERICAS

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, if Paul Revere were living today he would view the landing of Red arms in Guatemala as a signal to ride and warn the people of the Americas of the present acute danger of Communist infiltration of Latin America.

Paul Revere's historical ride of 179 years ago last month brought about action after words had failed. Much had been said about the danger to the freedom of the colonists in those days and many words had been spoken about the measures that would be taken to protect that freedom; however, words are meaningless unless backed by a concrete promise of action to give them meaning. Revere's ride brought out the minute men and sparked the action that preserved the freedom and liberty of the pioneer Americans. Today's situation is somewhat parallel. The American States are well aware of the threat of international communism. These States have on numerous occasions adopted resolutions calling for a cooperative effort on the part of the Americas to repel aggression and subversive infiltration. There is the Rio Treaty of 1947 and the resolution adopted in Bogotá in 1948. There is the fourth meeting of the hemispheric ministers in 1951 in Washington and the anti-Communist resolution adopted in Caracas in 1954. Words in opposition to communism and subversive infiltration have been expressed by the American States but the action to implement these words is lacking.

Tensions are growing between Guatemala and neighboring Honduras and Nicaragua. A Soviet-inspired attack on these countries by Guatemala is quite conceivable in order for the Reds to gain ports in the Caribbean Sea for use of their submarine fleet and to obtain bases for an attack on the Panama Canal in the event of world war III. Furthermore, control of Guatemala on the Pacific and of Honduras on the Atlantic side would furnish the Communists with a land avenue between the two oceans which would be of immense value to the Soviets in a global war.

The 1947 Rio Treaty is comparable to Paul Revere's ride for it is the vehicle that provides the American States with the opportunity to employ action. The sixth article of this treaty provides:

If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereign or political independence of American States should be effected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extracontinental or intracontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on

the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent.

In Guatemala, today, a challenge has been made on the freedom pacts between the American States. Nicaragua has severed diplomatic relations with Communist-infiltrated Guatemala. The United States has signed military-assistance pacts with Nicaragua and Honduras. This, however, falls far short of the necessary action that should be taken in this grave situation. It is imperative that the hemispheric foreign ministers be summoned to a fifth meeting so that the truth about the landing of Soviet arms in Guatemala can be revealed and so that proper steps can be taken to cope with the challenge to Western Hemisphere security. Such a meeting is required by considerations of hemispheric security, for the political future of the Americas and the prestige of their political institutions, as well as our own security, demand such action at once. The 1947 Rio Treaty, like Paul Revere's ride, is a motivating force that calls together today's minutemen of the Americas for action to preserve the freedom of the Western Hemisphere. Let us hope that we rise to the occasion as the Colonists did 179 years ago.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders previously granted.

POLICE AND FIREMEN HAVE SECURITY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Fraternal Order of Police and City Firemen, not only in my district but throughout the entire State of Indiana and in various other States, have been protected by a well-established and proven pension system for years. The protection and security given police and firemen and their families by reason of their well-established and sound pension system has been the main reason that municipalities have been able to secure outstanding high-class men to go into the hazardous and necessary public service.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House was requested and asked by the police and firemen associations to exclude them from the social-security system. Unfortunately, the majority of the members of the committee have seen fit to reject their request and place them under the new social-security legislation which they are now considering. I believe that the Members of Congress should respect the request coming from the various police and firemen associa-

tions in opposition to being placed under a social-security category.

The main purpose of the social-security legislation is protection of the beneficiary and his family against lack of security for his home and the needs for old age and retirement. The police and firemen's established retirement and pension fund is now serving as an adequate protection for these public servants engaged in the hazardous protection of property and lives of millions.

I wish to incorporate with my remarks a telegram from the Fraternal Order of Police in East Chicago, Ind., and Hammond, Ind.:

EAST CHICAGO, IND., May 20, 1954.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

All members of the East Chicago Police Department, East Chicago, Ind., both retired and active, are deplored and very much disappointed by the action of the House Ways and Means Committee in the adoption of an amendment to H. R. 7199, eliminating exclusion of police and fire groups from social-security coverage.

Knowing you to be a friend of all police and firemen, we of the East Chicago Police Department unanimously appeal to you as our Representative in Congress and urge you to use all facilities at your command to prohibit police and firemen from being included in social-security coverage in lieu of present retirement systems.

EAST CHICAGO POLICE PENSION FUND,
BAC ANTHONY B. CAK, Secretary.

HAMMOND, IND., May 22, 1954.

CONGRESSMAN RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We the 164 members of Fraternal Order of Police Lodge No. 51, Hammond, Ind., urge you to use your influence with the House Ways and Means Committee to get them to exclude police and firemen who have a pension system from social security.

LOUIS SZANY,
Secretary of F. O. P., Lodge 51.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time in deference to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY DEFINED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, today the air is full of talk about bipartisanship, or the lack of it, in foreign policy. I believe the American people favor the bipartisanship conduct of our foreign policy. The American people know that the security of the Nation, and of the free world, should not be made a political football for partisan advantage. They know that the threats to freedom in the world today are too great to allow our foreign policy to become involved in a political free-for-all.

But what, Mr. Speaker, is the true definition of bipartisanship? There are those who would define bipartisanship as that which the party out of power says the party in power is not practicing. On the other hand, there are those who define bipartisanship as the making of policy by the party in power and then telling the party out of power what that policy is and demanding support for it.

These halls are full of experts on the definition of a bipartisan foreign policy, and each has his own interpretation of what this means. But the man who should be an expert on this subject, Mr. Speaker, is the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, the President's chief agent in the foreign policy field. Mr. Dulles can speak from experience because his qualifications come in part from the services he was asked to perform in the Democratic administration's pursuance of a bipartisan foreign policy, in past years.

A few years ago Mr. Dulles set down in writing some fundamental principles of bipartisanship. It is worthwhile to recall these Dulles principles today and compare them with the experience of the last 16 months. In this connection I respectfully suggest that Mr. Dulles take a few hours off and reread his book, *War or Peace*, in which these principles of bipartisanship were set forth. This book was published in 1950. Perhaps it would also be well if the Secretary of State would send a complimentary copy of his book for the President to read.

Mr. Dulles has outlined five basic principles of bipartisanship, which can be found in his book, pages 182-184. These are, in the words of Mr. Dulles:

1. The primary responsibility for bipartisanship rests upon the administration in power. Under the Constitution the President, and the President alone, decides on how to conduct foreign affairs. He can conduct them alone or with others, as he desires; the decision is his. Without his positive action there can be no bipartisanship. The opposition has no right or possibility of intruding itself. Bipartisanship can come about only through presidential invitation.

2. An invitation to members of the opposition to participate in making foreign policy is meaningless and is a sham unless it is made to loyal members of their party, trusted by party leadership.

3. The opposition members selected to participate in making foreign policy bipartisanship should be qualified by training and experience to make a genuine contribution and to take an active and constructive part in the formulation of foreign policy. If the opposition party is to cooperate with the administration on foreign policy, the participation must be meaningful. Nominal participation is not good enough.

4. The opposition participants must have opportunity to get in at the early shaping of foreign policies and must not be left out until the end, when matters have gone so far that there is little opportunity to do other than acquiesce. As Governor Stassen remarked, "Republicans should be in at the take-off and not merely at the crash landing." Often in recent years Republicans have been faced with administration decisions which seemed unwise; but repudiation had disadvantages even greater than going along with what they deemed unsound. That was true of the loan to England of \$3,750,000,000 in 1946. The conditions attached to the loan as regards repayment, trade, and currency exchangeability are revealing of how, in those days, even the best informed members

of the administration saw only through a glass, darkly.

But when the loan terms first came to Republican attention, our Government was so far committed that repudiation would probably have been more costly than acquiescence.

By appeals to patriotism, an appearance of bipartisan cooperation may temporarily be forced. But in the long run, that merely builds up smoldering resentment which will some day break out.

5. In these foregoing respects, the administration has the responsibility. If, however, the four preceding conditions are met, then the opposition party has a duty also. Obviously no party can be expected to give a blank check, and there is no party machinery for doing so. The opposition party in this country, unlike the British opposition, has no officially defined leadership. "Titular" leadership is not enough. But if opposition members of the character and competence we have indicated receive the kind of opportunity we have described to help make the foreign policy, then the opposition Members of Congress should not seek to make political capital by attacking the results, but should support them through treaty ratifications and congressional appropriations as far as their convictions permit.

If the leaders of the opposition party refuse at this critical time, as a matter of partisan advantage, to accept a bona fide offer to make foreign policies cooperatively, so that those policies can command unity at home and attract adherence abroad, then those who take that position ought to be repudiated at the polls. Refusal by the administration to make such a bona fide offer ought to insure a like fate.

We are dealing with the safety of the American Nation and of the liberties and freedoms that are our most precious heritage. That concerns, most of all, the people themselves. They should make their understanding manifest by a will which even the most politically minded will respect.

Mr. Speaker, these were the carefully thought-out principles of bipartisanship as set forth by our present Secretary of State. One would expect that Mr. Dulles, having become Secretary of State, would attempt to put these principles into practice; would advise the President that without his positive action there can be no bipartisanship.

In these past 16 months, Mr. Dulles has been in a position to carry out these principles earlier set forth. The fact that Mr. Dulles, and many other Republicans, occupied high positions in previous Democratic administrations, proves that under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman bipartisanship was the rule rather than the exception. What has been Mr. Dulles' record on bipartisanship? I am afraid there are indications that he is of the "do as I do, not as I say" school.

It is impossible to review here the full record of United States foreign policy of the last 16 months. But let us take one case study and apply to it the Dulles theory and the Dulles practice.

The most widely advertised basic decision in foreign military policy in the past 16 months has been the so-called New Look. This was, in the January 12 words of Mr. Dulles, the placing of "more reliance on deterrent power and less dependence on local defensive power."

This was announced by Mr. Dulles himself on January 12 as a "basic decision." The basic policy decision was "to

depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our own choosing."

Hence a fundamental policy decision was made. It was widely heralded and announced as a basic policy decision, made by the National Security Council. After its announcement on January 12, Mr. Dulles and other highly placed Republican orators in the executive department and in Congress went out to the country in a chest-thumping enterprise to merchandise this grand and glorious accomplishment which they said allowed this Nation to have more national security at wholesale prices. National security and a balanced budget seemed to be a prize attainable at an early date under this basic new policy. Soon the boys could be brought home from foreign shores and maybe even taxes could be heavily reduced.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, we were told, was to be the result of some basic policy decisions. Now, I must ask: Who made these decisions? Mr. Dulles was certainly in on them. This, mind you, is the same Mr. Dulles who had earlier been teaching us the fundamental principles of bipartisanship. We were at least under the impression that we had been taught how to achieve bipartisanship in five easy lessons.

Now, the objection might be raised that this New Look was not a new policy after all; that it simply had been overmerchandised. In summary, the purportedly new policy was this:

First. A basic decision to depend primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate instantly and by means and at places of our own choosing.

Second. Dependence on the deterrents of massive retaliatory power rather than local defense.

Third. The creation of a strategic reserve of ground forces which would improve our defense posture.

This was substantially the New Look, and Mr. Dulles agrees that it is. Now, was it really a new decision—a new policy?

Well, let us ask Mr. Dulles. I am now quoting from the Secretary of State's testimony before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations:

Senator MANSFIELD. Do you consider this new policy a new policy?

Secretary DULLES. It certainly has new aspects. (Hearings, March 19, 1954, p. 42.)

Now, let us recall for a moment Mr. Dulles' advice on bipartisanship. He said:

If the opposition party is to cooperate with the administration on foreign policy, the participation must be meaningful. Nominal participation is not enough. The opposition participants must have opportunity to get in at the early shaping of foreign policies and must not be left out until the end, when matters have gone so far that there is little opportunity to do other than acquiesce.

Apparently Mr. Dulles had forgotten that he has ever written a book when he told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

Mr. DULLES. Up to the point where you bring in your budget and you ask the Congress to approve a military budget and you explain what the theory of your budget is, and why you are cutting down somewhat on

the Army or you are building somewhat more on the air, that is the time, and the first time it takes, actually, a clear-cut decision of the kind which Congress would have to come in and share the responsibility for partnership. (Hearings, March 19, 1954, p. 43.)

Now apparently Mr. Dulles had not done his homework. He forgot to read his own book; he forgot to refresh himself on his own set of rules for bipartisanship.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, as far as the record shows, the New Look, which Mr. Dulles said in his January 12 speech was a basic policy decision, was formulated and announced by the Republican administration without consulting or discussing it with any of the congressional committees concerned. It was not, in the period of its formation, brought before the Armed Services Committee of either House, nor the Senate Foreign Relations Committee nor the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD stated this as a fact in the hearings and was challenged neither by Secretary Dulles, nor members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of either party.

Only when appropriations were needed, only when it was time to ask for money for this new policy was Mr. Dulles, forgetting his bipartisanship principles, ready to come to Congress.

On second thought, Mr. Dulles qualified this. Perhaps he had a sudden memory that he had once written a book—a book on How To Build a Bipartisan Foreign Policy.

He told the Senators:

Perhaps I should have met with the committee beforehand. I am quite prepared to accept a measure of blame in this respect, but I have sought this opportunity as promptly as I could, after getting back from these two conferences, to meet on this subject with the committee as I am doing here today.

"Today" was March 19, 1954. Mr. Dulles had announced the basic New Look policy decision over 2 months earlier. Such a decision involved not only the fundamental foreign policy of this Nation, but also basic concepts of military strategy and planning. The decisions made without consulting Congress will affect our national security and military strength for many years to come.

It is clear from this brief description of the New Look case that Mr. Dulles, and the administration generally, did not live up to practicing the fundamental principles of bipartisanship. The Secretary of State had set up a good set of rules; but he forgot to practice them.

Mr. Speaker, for many months I have expressed grave doubts about certain aspects of the New Look. The situation in southeast Asia has given us a painful example of its shortcomings. I am sincerely confident that if bipartisanship principles had been followed in the formation of military-foreign policy some of the defects in that policy may have been eliminated. Perhaps there would not be talk now of an even newer look at United States military-foreign policy. Meanwhile, this Nation may be suffering at this moment from a lack of aviation pilots, a scarcity of trained foot soldiers,

and other military deficiencies which are the direct result of too much emphasis on slicing the budget and not enough emphasis on the realities of the world situation.

I take no partisan delight in recounting recent events or in pointing to the inconsistencies of the Nation's top leadership. I suspect that many of these Republican leaders have become the prisoners of their own political campaign oratory.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that this Republican campaign oratory continues in the face of the as yet ineffective attempts of the President to curb members of his official family. Mr. Speaker, a fundamental roadblock to bipartisanship will exist until the fear, smear, innuendo, and misrepresentation are removed from the texts of speeches by members of the President's team.

Members of the President's staff, including, of all persons, his legal counsel; members of the President's Cabinet, with few exceptions; and members of the Republican Party under the direct sponsorship of the Republican National Committee have engaged in a campaign of slander against past Democratic administrations which is not only an insult to the intelligence of the American people but is a serious obstacle to bipartisanship in foreign policy. This involves the safety and welfare of our people and of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, the man who can remedy this situation is the President of the United States. If the President will read Mr. Dulles' book, he will be reminded that bipartisanship is the responsibility of the administration in power. He will be reminded that without positive Presidential action, there can be no bipartisanship.

It will take more than frequent briefings of congressional committees. It will take more than patronizing remarks by the President in press conference that Democrats are exactly as loyal as Republicans. Why was it ever necessary for the head of the Republican Party to make such a remark about the loyalty of Democrats? The world knows it was because of a calculated, Republican-sponsored attack upon Democrats in the greatest smear campaign of all times. False charges of treason, promoted under official national committee sponsorship, and the impugning of the loyalty, motives, and patriotism of leading Americans by members of the President's official family have made a mockery of decency in American political life.

It is time for aggressive Presidential action; it is time for the President to deal in personalities; it is time for the President to take control.

It is time for the President to lead effectively this Nation back to bipartisanship; to create an atmosphere in which our two great political parties can work in harmony, at least in the realm of international security.

The mutual confidence of Americans in their Government and their leaders has been seriously undermined by this partisan extremism.

We have before us a set of noble principles, written by the Republican Secretary of State. They provide an ade-

quate definition of bipartisanship. The emphasis is on Presidential leadership; positive action in this direction from the White House.

Democrats generally stand ready to cooperate. United action at home must be possible before there can be talk of international united action.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman would address his attention to the speech I made on the floor last Thursday in which I called attention to the record where Secretary Dulles a hundred times—he and his Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries—have consulted with the minority party where they had an opportunity of discussing these things and had an opportunity to put forth their views. I wonder if the gentleman would direct his attention to that and would tell us if he disagrees with that as a record, and with what he disagrees.

Mr. PRICE. Yes, certainly I do disagree with that as a record. I might say to the gentleman that is probably the reason for the remarks I am making here today, and if he will listen attentively he will see that the statements made in his remarks are all refuted herein.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, on May 11, Senator KNOWLAND detailed those conferences. I wonder if the gentleman would pay attention and particularly discuss those details. Of course, when one engages in generalities, it is always possible to get into a long discussion on things, but the details are what are important.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman from Missouri who is my good friend will just be patient, he will see that my remarks are not generalities and that I will give a detailed reply to the statement which he has made.

I might say to the gentleman, if he will listen carefully, this is not a general statement. It is a detailed statement, and he will be answered in full. But I would like to say to the gentleman that the meetings he is talking about were so-called briefings that occur frequently in Congress, and have little to do with the formulation of foreign policy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have participated in a number of those meetings, and with the exception of one they have all been briefings, or consultations after decision had been made—mostly briefings. Nothing was asked of the minority as to policy except in one instance, and it was very fortunate that it was asked, because both the minority and majority leaders were there where a question of policy was involved, and it was probably very fortunate or we might be in a different position today than we have been during the last several weeks. Every other meeting I have attended, and I have been glad to participate in them, has been briefings or matters where the opinion of the minority in connection with policy was not sought, and, of course, it was not gratuitously given.

Mr. PRICE. Of course, the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I have only a half an hour allotted and if I am to finish this statement I think I had better go ahead.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am sorry that the gentleman did not devote his attention to the details of the RECORD of May 11.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman must not have been listening because I did. Of course, I could take a great deal of time and go into it more thoroughly with the gentleman and I will be glad to do so.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I wish the gentleman would do.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman was answered very satisfactorily, in my opinion, by the gentleman from Massachusetts. We know there have been briefings of congressional committees. I mentioned that. But those briefings have been after policies were formulated, after plans were made and they did not take the minority party into their confidence at the outset in making the plans. I think I covered that very thoroughly in my remarks.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Has the majority party or the administration established any consistent pattern that it can point to as a basis for bipartisanship other than a sporadic series of meetings under which it now claims a bipartisan foreign policy has been established?

Mr. PRICE. I think that is a pretty good point, and I do not think the administration has. I think the Congress and the minority leadership have been kept pretty well in the dark about plans until they were well under way.

Mr. YATES. Can the administration point to one appointment of major significance of any member of the minority party to provide a bipartisan foreign policy?

Mr. PRICE. No; and I would like to have somebody on that side inform us in that regard.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, did not the administration request the resignation of one of our Nation's outstanding experts on Russia, namely, Mr. George Kennan?

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. With reference to the statement by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], when the administration got rid of Mr. Kennan, they served notice to the American people that they had no need for the author of the morally bankrupt policy of containment and that the hidden policy of containment would

no longer be tolerated in the Government. I should like to state that the critical situation in which we find ourselves today develops from the fact that supporters of the policy of containment are still playing a major role in the development of our strategy against the international Communist conspiracy. All of us who are awaiting the bold and dynamic foreign policy promised by the present administration had our hopes lifted up after Mr. Kennan's departure from the Department of State. However, we are still waiting for that bold and dynamic approach to all problems related to our security, but it appears that Mr. Dulles still has a long way to go in getting such a policy accepted within the Department of State. One of our problems is that we have too many Russian experts who are more concerned with the preservation of the Russian empire in one form or another and who show no real understanding of the relationship between Russian colonialism and Communist colonialism.

Mr. YATES. I am sorry to disagree with my friend from Ohio in respect to Mr. Kennan, but I must. All authorities indicate that he is one of our best trained and experienced diplomats.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would just like to tell the gentleman a little experience I had as one Member of the so-called leadership of this House, which the gentleman apparently completely ignores. As a Member of the then minority, I was called to the White House on Tuesday, June 27, 1950, and received the shock of my life when I heard President Truman announce a decision already being executed that we were going to war in Korea. To the best of my information, no one of us, not even the leadership, on this side of the House, had any knowledge before that of such action. Now, if there is anything bipartisan about such procedure, I would like to know what it is. The people resented such questionable action without Congress even being consulted. Now, if the gentleman will take the time to go back a little bit—

Mr. PRICE. I will tell the gentleman that I did go back quite a bit, and I pointed out that we consistently had a policy of bipartisanship both under President Roosevelt and under President Truman, and that the outstanding leaders of the Republican Party were in on the formation of policy. They were taken into the confidence of the national leadership; they had an equal voice in the formation of policy, and that is attested to by the fact that Senator Vandenberg, Republican, represented the minority, with equal status of his Democratic colleagues, in foreign policy deliberations.

Mr. ARENDS. It was at 11 o'clock of the morning of going into Korea that we were told what was going to happen.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman is making quite a bit to do about the fact that it was a sudden affair, and they could not be called on any sooner because of the emergency.

Mr. ARENDS. It was on Tuesday that the President called in the leadership of the minority party, and we were given the information. This all happened over the Saturday to Monday weekend, but we were not called in on it until Tuesday when all decisions had been made.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman knows they were called in as quickly as they could under the conditions existing.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I attended those conferences, and I do not remember one of those conferences that had to do with policy that Senator Vandenberg was not present. I remember one of them when the President was setting up some kind of a board or committee to do something, and Senator Vandenberg asked would he appoint John Foster Dulles on that board or commission, whatever it was, and the President did so. Every time that I was present at one of those meetings—and I think the then majority leader will bear me out on this—where there was a fundamental question of foreign affairs to be discussed, Senator Vandenberg was always there as well as some other Republican leaders.

Mr. PRICE. There is nobody better qualified to inform the House than the gentleman from Texas, who just spoke.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mrs. CHURCH), Mr. PRICE was granted permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to say to my good colleague from Illinois that far from being angered by his speech, I am a bit shocked by it. I cannot see what he is doing for his country or even for his party by attempting at this dangerous hour to make so vicious an attack upon the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. I am particularly disturbed because the gentleman does not happen to be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House.

Mr. PRICE. I might say to the gentleman for whom I have very deep admiration, I am not making a vicious attack on the President.

True, I do not happen to be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs but point out I have addressed my remarks principally to the New Look in military foreign policy and I am a member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

There have been some speeches made which the lady may recall—

Mrs. CHURCH. I was listening quite intently.

Mr. PRICE. There have been several speeches made on the floor of the House in the last week, and I remember one in particular, to the effect that the minority attempted to shoot their way into the bipartisan foreign policy. I have merely tried to point out that it is not the minority's province even to force its way into it, but it is the responsibility of the

leadership of the administration, to call them into it. There has been considerable discussion about an effort to bring about a bipartisan foreign policy. I am merely trying to point out to the House and the leadership where the responsibility for this lies, in view of the several speeches to the contrary that were made on this floor, within the last week.

Mrs. CHURCH. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation. I should like to ask him if he does not realize that what the President and the Secretary of State have inherited is a condition for which his party laid the groundwork. I would say that one reason his party lost in the last election was because the American people were tired of the Acheson foreign policy.

Mr. PRICE. Of course, I do not believe that to be the fact at all. I do not think our Government should be blamed for world conditions. It is about time that the American people were laying the blame where it belongs, on the Kremlin. I do not know why so many people are interested in blaming our Government for all the ills of the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he does not believe that in spite of the recriminations that are being brought forward from the minority side about what previous administrations did or did not do, that it would be wise and to the best interests of our country to establish a policy of bipartisanship, and that this is necessary regardless whether it was established by the Roosevelt and Truman administrations or not. We seem to be in general agreement that a policy of bipartisanship is desirable in order to provide for a coherent and consistent plan for the future.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Just the other day one of the Members of the other body who sat in on one of these bipartisan policy meetings of the present administration, got up from that table and made the remark, "this is the finest and the clearest explanation of our foreign policy that I have ever heard, and the most frank discussion of it that has ever been given, that I know of." Of course, I cannot identify him by name, except to say that he was a member of the minority party.

He said that in my presence and in the presence of the others who were present.

Mr. YATES. It is probably the first time he ever heard the foreign policy explained.

Mr. ARENDS. He is one of the leaders on the minority side.

Mr. PRICE. He had nothing to do with the formation of that foreign policy.

Mr. ARENDS. He had the opportunity to express himself on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, let us get the record clear. To begin with, President Truman had the courage to make his decision on Korea. The President of the United States occupies two positions, one as President and one as Commander in Chief. President Eisenhower trapped himself when he said that he would send everything up to Congress. That sounded big, but he trapped himself for the time when he would be called upon to exercise his duties as Commander in Chief in time of war or grave emergency confronting our country.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] knows that when we were at the office of the Secretary of State several weeks ago, when the decision was put up to the leaders of the Congress, that decision, if the national interest of our country was involved, should have been made by the President himself as Commander in Chief.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to say that if any Members of the House are truly interested in a bipartisan foreign policy, if they will read my speech, they will see that there is not a single statement in that speech to which any Member could take exception.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time, because I was unable to propound certain questions that I wanted to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. No. 1, I noticed in his speech that he referred constantly to various hearings at which Secretary Dulles made certain remarks. I was unable to get the dates of those hearings and I wonder whether the gentleman will include those dates in his remarks.

Mr. PRICE. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri I would not have to make any alterations in my remarks because they are already included in them. If the gentleman will read the RECORD tomorrow he will find the dates. He will also find, if he is interested in bipartisanship, nothing in my remarks to which he could take exception.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There were several places where the dates were lacking. That is the reason I asked that question.

The second thing I would like to call attention to is that in my speech of Thursday I made these remarks in regard to the test of bipartisanship. I stated:

It consists in taking on the responsibility for shaping policy, but in doing so keeping the opposite party leaders fairly informed of the facts and giving them an opportunity to ask questions and make suggestions before a course is set or taken.

Then I stated:

This has been done.

The record is there. If it is in error, let us have the refutation.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman will find the refutation, if he will read my remarks carefully.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I heard the gentleman's remarks, and I do not think there was a refutation. That is why I am taking this 10 minutes.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority whip, made a very pertinent remark, and to follow through on that, if his remark applies to these various meetings then indeed I am very much interested, because he grapples with the issue head on.

In the gentleman's remarks he said that these conferences which have been detailed—there were over 100 of them—were not really conferences but were in effect just briefings where your people were simply told without the opportunity of getting your own views expressed, without the opportunity of having the decision made after you had your own views expressed, without the opportunity of being able to ask questions and ask for information. If that is the way these conferences were held, I fully agree with the gentleman in his criticism, but my understanding is from talking with people who were there that that is not the case, that these indeed were really conferences at which you had your views expressed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not say that he was present at 100 conferences.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, I appreciate that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I said that at the conferences at which I was present there were mighty few, in fact, only one, at which that situation obtained. When you have 10 or 12 leaders present on both sides, after the explanatory statement is made by the Secretary or whoever is there you do not have much time to ask many questions. They were very courteous, and I have no criticism of that, but at every one of the meetings I attended except one the decision had been made. We were called down for a briefing. The decision was not made in a meeting that took place several weeks ago in Secretary Dulles' office, and that is the only time I have attended any meeting where I felt I was sitting in before the act rather than after the act.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will pay attention to the reinsertion in the RECORD I made of the remarks of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONN], who is a member of the gentleman's party and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, he will find at that time the gentleman from Connecticut said that he was satisfied with those conferences, that he felt he had an opportunity to be consulted and offer suggestions. To me there is the issue involved, and I hope that we will keep on that point, because I could not agree with the gentleman more if those con-

ferences were not really conferences. I happen to take the same position he does. However, my understanding is, and the Secretary of State has made the statement, that these were not briefings, as you might call them, but indeed were actually consultations. We can get into the gist of this whole debate and resolve it quite quickly, then, by simply finding out from the people who were at these one-hundred-odd conferences what was their nature. If the gentleman's party or his leadership was cut off in asking questions or in presenting its point of view, and if the decision had been made before this consultation and you were told to take it or leave it, I agree with you, but I do not think that was the case—and that is where the issue is.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman referred to an item which was in his statement concerning the statement made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONN]. As I read that statement, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONN] said that he was consulted beforehand in connection only with a speech which the Secretary of State proposed to make and that this was a very good policy. However, I should like to point out that this is the only instance in which the gentleman from Connecticut refers to any consultation by the Secretary of State. As I read the statement which the gentleman put into the RECORD, that is the only reference to it that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONN] makes, is it not?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, and may I say that is a fair statement, but it is obvious he was making that statement because he felt the criticism against the Secretary of State was not well founded and that he was citing a specific example to demonstrate the fact that he, at least, was consulted.

Mr. YATES. He was consulted only in that one instance.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Not necessarily. He cited an instance as an example. May I say to the gentlemen I think that is the way to handle this thing. If there are other instances where the loyal opposition has not been consulted in this fashion, that is what we want to know. Let us get the details.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I happen to know that we have had consultation with Mr. Dulles before every trip that he has taken and after every trip when he has come back. If Mr. DONN was only there once, the fault lies with Mr. DONN for not coming to the committee meetings. We have had more consultations like this in the last year than we ever had in the 13 years that I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it has been real consultation and not just from the Secretary, but from the Assistant Secretaries of the different regions. We have had an entirely new method of procedure on the part of the executive in his dealing with the House

Committee on Foreign Affairs on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If I could just make one correction, may I point out that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was by no means complaining about procedures and I presume he has been very good in his attendance at these meetings. I think we should define this issue and find out just how these consultations are conducted—or if they are briefings—then there is the issue. If they are conducted, as I understand they are, then I say the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle do not have a well-founded complaint because the detailed record has been clearly set out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11 in the speech of Senator KNOWLAND. That is why I said the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois did not deal with the details at all because he went off into a general theory of foreign policy.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would just like to say with respect to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio, and I am sorry to note that she has left the Chamber, that it is a good thing the Secretary of State takes as many trips as he does because apparently those are the only times that he consults the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that is, before he goes and after he returns.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Is that not a good thing?

Mr. YATES. Of course, but he should consult more frequently than he has.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. One hundred times in 18 months is pretty good, I think.

Mr. YATES. Does the gentleman declare that the Secretary of State has consulted with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House over 100 times?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I said there are 100 times that the State Department has consulted with the Democratic leaders and about 45 of the times, the Secretary himself, and that is all put down by date in the May 11 speech of Senator KNOWLAND, showing what the occasion was. Those details are in the RECORD. I wish you people on the other side of the aisle would read that and direct your remarks to this detailed information.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad that this discussion came up this morning because the gist of it has been brought out here in the last 5 minutes in the colloquy between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If you will go back and read the RECORD, Senator Vandenberg found that was his complaint back in the early days in reference to our foreign policy as it concerned China. He complained that the State Department was coming down and telling him things without real consultation. I talked with one Assistant Secretary of State within the last 3 years who told me Mr. Marshall, when he was Secretary of State, sent him down to tell

Mr. Vandenberg things. He went to his office and he would give the information to Senator Vandenberg. Senator Vandenberg replied, "You understand this is not consultation, this is only talk." I think you are down to the real nub of the thing here as to whether or not you are getting consultation. If there is not any consultation, then I think the gentleman from Massachusetts has a valid complaint because it is the very complaint that Senator Vandenberg had against the State Department some 10 years ago. If it is consultation, then I do not think the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have a complaint, if you enter into that consultation and arrive at an agreement. But I do believe you have gotten down to the real heart of the matter which should contribute something really valuable in solving the questions that have been holding back the unity and the amity of purpose in the matter of foreign policy consultation at the high level.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) Mr. CURTIS of Missouri was granted 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one thing I want to say on this subject, in this speech of Senator KNOWLAND, which is in the RECORD of May 11, he also devotes considerable time to the times and places under the previous administration, where the Republicans were not consulted. The recitation, incidentally, deals mainly with the complaints of Senator Vandenberg, which were about the failure to consult.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think out of this meeting may come a great deal of good. In other words, we all want unity, because the challenge confronting us confronts our country and all of us as Americans. So, in evaluating this, I am glad the speech was made by my friend from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] took the time, and these various colloquies have taken place, because out of it may come a great deal of good. Not for the purpose of embarrassment at all, because we can all go back and pick up things of the past, but that is not going to decide the present—but in the past administration there were fine outstanding Americans who happened to be politically members of the Republican Party, holding Cabinet offices. That is important in a bipartisan relationship when an emergency confronts our country. I am not criticizing the fact that there is not, but there is a thought there. I have said that the only meeting I personally attended, they were all nice meetings, and I was glad to be there, and I am going to be at one this afternoon—I do not know what its purpose is, but I will be there—

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. You had full opportunity to ask questions, did you not? Did you think you had a chance or did you not?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Under the practical situation as it exists, you cannot ask questions like you could in a committee, because you are not going

to have hearings continued from day to day. So the answer is "Yes." But there is a difference between asking questions after the fact and being consulted on important questions of policy before the fact.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Now that is a fair comment. The next question is, Had decision been made before you were consulted?

Mr. McCORMACK. With one exception, at any meeting I have attended, they were. Of course some of them were briefings, where there was no decision involved, where they were keeping us acquainted with the world situation or a particular one. So there have been some meetings that took place where there was no decision made. But in answer to the question, in the number of meetings that I have attended there has been only one where I felt I was consulted before the fact.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman if he ever used this technique in any of those meetings: "Now this comes rather quickly. Could we have an opportunity to ask some questions before anything is done?" Did you avail yourself of that technique?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I have been at no meetings at which the President appeared.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; no. We are talking about the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have not had, nor as far as I know the Democratic leadership as such has not had a meeting with the President this year. We are hoping that the time will arrive when the President, as such, might have a meeting of the leaders of both branches. But that is a matter in his own discretion. The meetings I have attended have been pleasant, but they have only been consultation. What is consultation? Is it before the fact or after the fact?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is before the fact; and if that has been the case, you have got a just complaint.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can only testify about one occasion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But your party and your columnist friends have been making the issue that these 100 meetings have not been consultations; and I say if that is true, you have just cause for complaint, but the details are lacking.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let me ask my friend from Missouri a question. Assuming you were called in a council meeting before the facts where a policy was going to be established, you would expect that you would be advised by the executive branch, or the military, as to all the facts, for example, if there were any division on the particular matter between the Joint Chiefs of Staff, would you not?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would expect—and I would ask questions along that line, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Even without asking questions, if there were a division, you would expect to be advised.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Not necessarily volunteered, but I certainly would ask questions if I were at a meeting that way.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I am in a meeting—

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is not an especially important point.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I am in a meeting on a matter of policy I would expect them to give me briefly at least the pertinent facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CURTIS of Missouri was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. And one pertinent fact would be to inform those at the meetings that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not all agreed on the matter that was brought up.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As a pertinent issue; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had asked a question and I found to my great surprise only by asking the question that the Joint Chiefs of Staff did not all agree on the matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Does the gentleman believe that there was a willful deception there?

Mr. McCORMACK. Strike out "willful"; but silence when one is supposed to speak justifies one in thinking that there is a withholding, and I am entitled to know.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; and the question was answered and the gentleman was advised what the situation was.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I had no control. The thought that entered my mind was that it was strange that only one member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was present on that occasion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not think the gentleman seriously wants to stand on that. Whether he got the information through asking a question or whether it was volunteered does not matter as long as he was permitted to ask the question. The question was answered. It accomplishes the result.

Now I would like to direct my attention to a further remark.

Mr. McCORMACK. With all due respect to my friend, when I am sitting in a high policy meeting I expect that all present should be given the pertinent facts, and one of the most pertinent facts would be on the recommendation before us that we were passing upon, that there was a division among the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I would consider that to be of vital importance. I did.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman I think that is a fair criticism, to me, certainly, I would say this, that it does not go to the essence of this consultation we are talking about. That is a specific item of criticism. But you are surely not basing this whole criticism of a bipartisan foreign policy based upon that one particular thing when the gentleman's question was answered.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no; I will answer that; no, of course, not.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wonder if I could direct the gentleman's attention and answer, not necessarily answer. But I have a doubt as to whether or not high

Cabinet officials of the opposite political faith should be in the administration. In my speech on the floor on Thursday last I discussed that to some extent, and the point I was making was that this administration has been in power 18 months and it has—

Mr. McCORMACK. No; 16.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Sixteen—well, 18, a year and a half, a round figure, 16 months—and have taken over as they have all the policy agencies and departments where the bulk of the personnel in those departments have been all, following the natural sequence of events, appointed over the past 20 years by the previous Democrat administrations.

Mr. McCORMACK. But they were not all Democrats.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no, no; but there is a pretty good hunk of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I am not so sure about that sometimes. I had my experiences when I was not so sure about it. But go ahead, it is the gentleman's statement; I will not argue.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Further, as I pointed out, some of these positions over there have reached pretty high echelons and been covered by civil service. It has been the position of some of the leaders of my party and my own certainly—I will confine it to my own views—that many of these policy positions have been frozen under civil service which puts our party, the party of responsibility—and I know the gentleman agrees that the party in power should have the power to assume its responsibility—in an untenable position. Because of these frozen positions we have found ourselves in the situation where we could not fully implement our policy.

I will say, however, that once the State Department is balanced off, and perhaps it will be in another 2 or 3 years if we stay in power that long; we certainly should maintain the balance and not load it the other way; but I think the gentleman's point that it should be balanced off is well taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know what you mean by my saying "balanced off."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let me conclude my remarks. I say that your party did not get balanced off until after 8 years in power, and it was not until then that this Democrat bipartisanship policy began to take hold in the State Department.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has been going along in a very nice way, and I think he is making a very fine contribution. But the only inference I can draw from the gentleman's remarks is that in the matter of personnel he is in favor of—I will not say that you favor it, no—but the only way that he would cure it would be a breakdown of the civil service laws.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No; I do not want that. I am simply pointing out that the bulk of the personnel was appointed under previous Democrat administrations.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman means they were appointed in accordance with civil service laws?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Let us say that we are getting into another field of tremendous debate. So I will simply say they were under the civil service as administered by the previous administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

SOCIAL SECURITY AT 60

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this is the time to bring our social-security system up to date as to its retirement age as well as with regard to the other features which are now under consideration by the Congress. In my considered judgment, lowering the retirement age to age 60 is one of the most important improvements which could be made in the system at this time. Such a liberalization would make it possible for some 3 million Americans now between the ages of 60 and 65 to become eligible for benefits.

Now who are these people and why should they be entitled to benefits 5 years earlier than under present law? I believe most of you must be aware of the tragic circumstances of some of them because they are your own constituents. In your district, as in mine, there are men and women 60 years of age disabled by crippling disease and unable to work for that reason, but they can receive no social-security benefit until they reach their 65th birthday. In your district, as in mine, there are widows who have been told they must wait until they reach age 65 before they will be entitled to any benefit. In your district and mine men and women aged 60 have been laid off their jobs and have found it practically impossible to get another job because of their age.

Remember that these people have been regularly making their tax contribution into the social-security fund for the purpose of helping to meet the costs of retirement when it arrives. Now, when they need those benefits desperately, we tell them that they must wait until they reach age 65.

Meanwhile, in the case of older workers, unless they can find work in covered employment, the amount of the benefit they will receive at age 65 is being reduced by each one of the five years they must wait. Those five unproductive years will lower the amount of the average monthly wage upon which the benefit formula is based. I am aware of the fact that legislation now under study would in some degree prevent this loss through the 4-year drop-out clause. But I suggest that if the retirement age is lowered to 60 and the 4-year drop-out clause remains, we will be reaching down in the same way to protect people who

cannot work—or who cannot find work—at age 56. We all know that, regardless of any arbitrary age set by law, enforced retirement comes to different people at different ages. It is also true, of course, that any organized retirement plan such as social security must be built around some specific age or service requirements—but should also allow for some flexibility around these specifics to meet individual circumstances. Lowering the eligibility age from 65 to 60 in our social security system and retaining the 4-year drop-out clause in the proposed legislation would provide more flexibility of this kind.

In this connection it is important, I believe, to recognize that lowering the retirement age to 60 years would not mean that everyone eligible for benefits would automatically retire at that age. One good reason is that the average old-age benefit today is around \$51 a month—and legislation now under consideration would increase that amount by only about \$5 per month. That is not the kind of money which induces people to quit a good job in favor of retirement. It is one of the reasons why the average retirement age under existing law is not the statutory age 65 but age 69. Most Americans do not retire—at least under these circumstances—until they have to. But if they are forced to retire earlier, either because they are unable to work or they cannot find work, the lower eligibility age offers the kind of protection which a social-security system should provide.

Mr. Speaker, this is one feature of our social-security law which has received no modification whatever since the law was enacted in 1935. We are still using age 65 as the eligibility age, although we have modernized the system in practically every other respect. I remind you, too, that the age of 65 was chosen at that time arbitrarily and on the basis of no experience with the system. We have an opportunity today to reevaluate that decision made almost two decades ago on the basis of our experience with the system, and in the light of our tremendous industrial development and increased productivity as a nation.

This tremendous development of our productive machine is, I am convinced, another reason why a modernized social-security system should provide an earlier retirement age. Because of the great improvement in the techniques of production, we have been able to shorten the working day and the working week substantially since 1935. But, so far, we have made no change whatever in our concept of what constitutes a working lifetime from the point of view of social security.

The truth is that the very increase in our productivity is shortening the work life of most Americans very decisively. As I pointed out when I introduced my own bill, H. R. 6921, most evidence shows that job opportunities for older workers are decreasing simultaneously with the expansion of our economy. Studies made by the Department of Labor show that men and women who lose their jobs after age 45 have the greatest difficulty

finding new jobs. According to these studies, even those employers who keep older workers already on their payrolls put strict age limits when hiring new workers.

Tragically enough, about one-third of all persons applying for employment are 45 years of age and over. This evidence that older workers are the first casualties in the labor market is, in my opinion, one more very important reason why we should lower the eligibility age in old-age and survivors insurance at least to the age of 60.

And I call your special attention, on this point, to the fact that such a change would be of special benefit to the aged widows and dependent mothers of wage-earners who have died before reaching retirement age. Under present law, women are not entitled to benefits as widows until they reach age 65. If a bereaved widow has never had a job, or if she has been out of the labor market for the years that she was raising her family, her problem of supporting herself is often one of tragic proportions. Under existing law, she will be entitled to a widow's benefit if her husband was covered by social security. But not until she has reached age 65. If she was widowed at age 55, she must wait 10 years for that benefit. If she has no children under age 18 living in the home, or if she is unable to find work—either because of inexperience, prejudice, or ill health—she often has no recourse but public relief. Again lowering the eligibility age to 60 would be a step in the direction of relieving such misery. And for those wives and mothers who are between 60 and 65 when tragedy strikes, it would be avoided altogether.

As I have said before, the conditions of our time call as insistently for a shortening of the working life as they have for the shortening of the working day. For the most part, we have adjusted the hours of the working day—or of the working week—to meet modern conditions. But we are still wedded in our social-security system to a "working life" concept which dates back at least three decades.

I believe our social security system should be one which will make way for younger workers, and encourage a way of life which, in the democratic pattern, produces the maximum of economic progress and individual security. I believe that an amendment lowering the eligibility age from 65 to 60 would be one of the most humane improvements we can make in the social-security system for the reasons which I have just outlined.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. REES of Kan-

sas), for 10 days, an account of illness in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LIPSCOMB.
Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.
Mr. SAYLOR in two instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. McVEY and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. MCGREGOR in two instances.
Mr. MATTHEWS.
Mr. TRIMBLE in two instances.
Mr. BONIN and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. BENDER in five instances.
Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. GUBSER and to include a newspaper article.
Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. RODINO and to include a resolution.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 975. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2225. An act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4231. An act to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress;

H. R. 6374. An act to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7308. An act to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; and

H. R. 7541. An act to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1567. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 9, 1954, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Santa Maria River and its tributaries, California, authorized by an act approved May 14, 1937, and the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 400); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1568. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the report of the Attorney General on the administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the calendar year 1953, pursuant to the Foreign Agents Registration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 251. An act to amend section 1923 (a) of title 28, United States Code, relating to docket fees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1975. A bill to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act, as amended, to the Territory of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1976. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to permit the registration of judgments in or from the District Court for the Territory of Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 1667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6487. A bill to approve the repayment contract negotiated with the Roza Irrigation District, Yakima project, Washington, and to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7194. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Hermiston and West Extension Irrigation Districts, Oregon, and to authorize their execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8009. A bill to provide for the commitment and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6773. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain housing projects to the University of California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 9242. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations and for the Alaska communications system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9243. A bill to provide that the basic salaries of officers and members of the police force for the Washington National Airport shall be the same as the basic salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 9244. A bill to place restrictions upon the use of the United States mails for the dissemination of Communist propaganda; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 9245. A bill to establish a joint committee of Congress to study postal field service reclassification, to increase the rates of basic compensation of postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service pending reclassification pursuant to recommendations of such joint committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 9246. A bill to provide for grants to teachers' colleges so that teachers may be better prepared to assist in the prevention of narcotic addiction; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 9247. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Tacoma Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for the extension and improvement of the Port Industrial Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 9248. A bill to amend section 308 (5) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NOBLEAD:

H. R. 9249. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9250. A bill to provide for the construction of a project for flood-control protection at Lewistown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 9251. A bill to provide that two floating ocean stations shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 9252. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 9253. A bill to provide for a program of merchant ship construction in American

shipyards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 9254. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for Tacoma Harbor in the State of Washington in order to provide for the extension and improvement of the Port Industrial Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9255. A bill for the relief of Maurice Mumford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 9256. A bill for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 9257. A bill for the relief of the MacArthur Mining Co., Inc., in receivership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 9258. A bill for the relief of Kervok Sevag, Mrs. Virginia Sevag, and Sonia Sevag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9259. A bill for the relief of Judith Feldmar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9260. A bill for the relief of Luis Deriberprey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 9261. A bill for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 9262. A bill for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 9263. A bill for the relief of Gaetanina Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 9264. A bill for the relief of Isola Lopez y Royo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 9265. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Krueger and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 9266. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josette Filandre Hollingsworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

833. By Mr. BETTS: Petition of members of the First Evangelical United Brethren Church and the St. Paul's Evangelical United Brethren Church of Findlay, Ohio, supporting H. R. 1227, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

834. By Mr. BOYKIN: Petition of citizens of Washington and Mobile Counties, Ala., in support of H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

835. By Mr. CHENOWETH: Petition of 67 members and adherents of the United Presbyterian Church of Pueblo, Colo., urging passage of H. R. 1227, a bill prohibiting advertisements of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

836. By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Petition of residents of Mercer, Rock Island, and Warren Counties in support of H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

837. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island Library Association memorializing Congress with respect to Public Law 286, requiring all Federal agencies to reimburse the United States Post Office Department for their mail services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

838. By Mr. GARY: Petition of Mrs. W. S. Penley and 36 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

839. Also, petition of T. T. Dobbins and 99 citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

840. Also, petition of H. F. Keyser and 21 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

841. Also, petition of Mrs. Mabel J. Wiggins and 72 other citizens of Richmond, Va., deploring the dangerous influence of sales talk for alcoholic beverages being broadcast and urging legislative prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

842. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of citizens of Warren, Pa., favoring passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

843. Also, petition of citizens of Warren, Pa., favoring H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

844. Also, petition of the teenage class, the ladies' class, and men's Bible class of the Scrubgrass Presbyterian Church, Emlenton, Pa., favoring H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

845. Also, petition of citizens of Duke Center, Pa., favoring H. R. 1227, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

846. Also, petition of citizens of Smethport, Pa., favoring H. R. 1227, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

847. Also, petition of citizens of Russell and Akeley, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 1227, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

848. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 221 residents of Black Hawk County, Iowa, favoring the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc., and its broadcasting over radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

849. By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia: Petition of certain citizens of the cities of Staunton and Waynesboro and the county of Augusta, Va., citing excesses in the advertising of alcoholic beverages by newspaper, periodical, radio, and television, and urging prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

850. Also, petition of certain citizens of the cities of Winchester and Buena Vista and the counties of Amherst, Frederick, Page, Rockbridge, and Warren, Va., citing excesses in the advertising of alcoholic beverages by newspaper, periodical, radio, and television and urging prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

851. Also, petition of certain citizens of the city of Harrisonburg and the counties of Rockingham and Shenandoah, Va., citing excesses in the advertising of alcoholic beverages by newspaper, periodical, radio, and television, and urging prohibition of such advertising by approval of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

852. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of Mrs. Sid Roberts, Rogers, Ark., and others, expressing approval of H. R. 1227 to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

853. By Mr. HESELTON: Petition of Mrs. William C. Wright and others, of Shelburne Falls, Mass., urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

854. Also, petition of Rev. Robert F. Woltenweber, of the First Baptist Church of Colrain, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

855. Also, petition of Rev. Stephen R. Tucker, of the First Congregational Church of Turners Falls, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

856. Also, petition of Mrs. Alma E. Stalker and others, of Holyoke, Mass., urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

857. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph W. Reeves, of the Trinitarian Congregational Church of East Northfield, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

858. Also, petition of Rev. John H. Hyde and others, of Adams, Mass., urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

859. Also, petition of Harold D. Patterson, of Westfield, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

860. Also, petition of Edward Cowles, of Westfield, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

861. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Malcolm E. McGowan, of Westfield, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

862. Also, petition of Mrs. Myron White, of Granville, Mass., and others urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

863. Also, petition of Mrs. George L. Barbus, of Lithia, Mass., and others, urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

864. Also, petition of C. Frederick Dyer, of Plainfield, Mass., and others, in support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

865. Also, petition of Arthur H. Daniels and others, of North Adams, Mass., urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

866. Also, petition of Mahlon L. Henderson and others, of Pittsfield, Mass., urging support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

867. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Louisa Steu-
erwald and others, of Pittsfield, Mass., in support of the so-called Bryson bill, H. R. 1227;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

868. Also, petition of Miss Alexandrina Allyn and others, of Holyoke, Mass., in support of H. R. 1227, the so-called Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

869. By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition signed by approximately 1,500 persons resident in the vicinity of Whittier, Calif., urging the passage of H. R. 1227 and S. 3294, prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

870. By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Petition of Mrs. J. Wiley Owen and Aubrey R. McKenney relative to H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

871. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of William H. Marsell and other residents of Holliston, Mass., in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

872. Also, petition of Richard E. Porter and other residents of Massachusetts in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

873. Also, petition of Betty Wilson and other residents of Massachusetts, in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 1227); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

874. Resolution of the Knights of Columbus of Massachusetts in support of Senate Joint Resolution 126; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

875. By Mr. O'NEILL: Petition of the Grace Baptist Church, Somerville, Mass., in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, to prohibit advertising in the press and on the airways of alcoholic beverages, signed by Rev. J. S. Larrimore, Alfred R. Dugan, Marguerite Sawin, Ruth M. Jamieson, Francis Newell, Harold D. Taylor, Luella T. Connelly, Marion L. Leake, Eliza Reid, Jessie A. Smith, Olive Cochran, Bertha Foster, Jessie MacQuarrie, Emeline MacLean, Mary C. Loveless, Barbara Banks, Dorris L. Rice, Charles R. Rice, Earl Burnett, Elizabeth Banks, Allan G. Collier; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

876. By Mr. SHAFER: Petition of Mrs. Dene Way, secretary, St. Ann's Altar Society, Bellevue, Mich., and 47 other signers in support of Senate Joint Resolution 126; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

877. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Burlington, Wis., Dental Society opposing passage of House bill 2341, or any version thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

878. Also, resolution unanimously adopted whereby the mayor and the common council of the city of Elkhorn, Walworth County, Wis., go on record as vigorously opposing H. R. 2341; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

879. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petitions urging the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, signed by Rev. L. Clarence Schroeder and members of the East Congregational Church, Milton, Mass.; Rev. Gilbert Y. Taverner and members of the Hyde Park Methodist Church, Hyde Park; Rev. Harold H. Cramer and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Needham; Rev. Walter F. Ribbe, and members of the First Baptist Church, Weymouth; Rev. Robert L. Treese and members of St. Paul's Methodist Church, Quincy; Rev. Oliver L. Tanquary and members of the Union Congregational Church, East Braintree; Rev. Arthur W. Dyer and members of the Pilgrim Congregational Church, North Weymouth; Rev. J. Arthur Dahlstrand and members of the South Street Methodist Church, Brockton; Rev. Kenneth McCowan and members of the Blaney Memorial Baptist Church, Dorchester; Rev. Herschel W. Rogers and members of the First Baptist Church, Rockland; Miss Eunice A. Butterworth and members of the Weymouth

branch, National Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Rev. William H. Duvall and members of the Atlantic Methodist Church, North Quincy, and others; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

880. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of the Members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and friends of the churches of Michigan earnestly beseeching support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 1227, and the Langer bill, S. 3294, to prohibit interstate commerce the transportation of alcoholic beverages advertising in newspapers, periodicals, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

881. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Juliet Coyle and others, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to endorsing House Joint Resolution 243, amending the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States to include the words "under God"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

882. Also, petition of the president, Los Angeles chapter, American Association for the United Nations, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to requesting the establishment of Monday, October 24, 1955, the 10th anniversary of the ratification of the United Nations Charter, as a special legal, onetime holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

883. Also, petition of the recording secretary general, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D. C., relative to recommending an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would prevent any treaty or executive agreement from superseding the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

884. Also, petition of the city clerk, city of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., relative to incorporating the words "under God" in the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

885. Also, petition of A. W. Lafferty, Fenton Building, Portland, Ore., relative to requesting congressional investigation of Secretary McKay, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

886. Also, petition of Norman Parkhurst, Republican National Committeeman, Puerto Rico, relative to opposition to the Bow resolution with regard to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

887. Also, petition of Nellie Matthers and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social-security legislation, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

888. Also, petition of the secretary, County Clerk's Association of Illinois, Lawrence, Ill., relative to requesting the adoption of a pension and retirement program which will leave the initiative up to the individual States, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Poland and Monte Cassino

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1954

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker—

Polish soldiers—for our freedom and yours—have given our souls to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy, and our hearts to Poland.

This simple inscription is carved on the spire which stands on a hilltop above a military cemetery at Monte Cassino, in Italy. There lie buried more than a thousand Polish soldiers of the Polish Second Army Corps who gave their lives in the capture of the most crucial German fortification in Italy. The story of these Polish forces is perhaps one of the most tragic chapters in the history of World War II—but it is a chapter the last pages of which have not yet been written and will not be written until the free world proves that these men who were faithful to their service did not give their lives in vain. The Second Polish Army Corps was composed of the survivors of some million and a half Poles who, for one reason or another, had been detained in Russia after the Soviet invasion of Poland. With the outbreak of hostilities between Russia and Germany the Russians, for political and strategic reasons, decided to permit the formation of a Polish Army on Soviet soil. A military agreement to this effect was signed between Stalin and the Polish Premier, General Sikorsky. Gen. Wladislaw Anders, who had until that time been imprisoned under the most brutal conditions in the NKVD's infamous Lubianka Prison, was given the job of incorporating Poles in Russia into a fighting unit. The task that faced General Anders was a heartbreaking one. Many Poles could not be located or were not released, while those who were free to join were ill-clad, starved, and diseased. Gradually the camps began to disgorge some of the im-

prisoned Poles. They arrived by the thousands from the various Russian camps—men and women and children who had been prisoners of war or deported civilians. They came from all parts of Russia, barefoot, tattered, in remnants of old Polish uniforms. They represented a cross section of Polish life, for the Russians had systematically tried to drain Poland of all people of value to the nation. Some had been captured during the Soviet invasion, others had been arrested when they had tried to cross the frontier into some neutral country to join the Polish forces being organized in France, others were political and social leaders who had been imprisoned without trial on trumped-up charges of counterrevolutionary activity.

But, no matter what they had suffered, these people were eager to join the ranks of the new Polish Army. They came thousands of miles, in spite of Russian obstacles, with only one idea in mind—to fight once again for the liberation of Poland. Their single mindedness was matched only by their great religious faith, and, as the Polish Army knelt for its first mass even the faithless jeerings of the NKVD agents and the Russian soldiers were momentarily silenced.

In spite of the Stalin-Sikorsky agreement the situation was such that General Anders realized the importance of evacuating the Polish forces and their families. This was the only means of saving the thousands of lives which would have otherwise perished at the hands of the Russians. For the sake of expediency the Russians let the Polish forces and their families go. In Palestine, Iran, and Iraq General Anders completed the mobilization of the Second Army Corps. These men who had had to train with wooden rifles were now finally being fully equipped and prepared to join the Allied effort.

In the meantime Polish-Russian relations had deteriorated to the danger point, and in April of 1943 Russia broke off diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London. In Poland itself the situation was no better. As the Germans retreated their terrorism increased,

and as the Russians advanced it became evident that they were going to keep what they had liberated. But in spite of this, in early 1944 the Second Polish Army Corps was ready for action, and on February 6 the first troops landed at Naples.

This was not the first time that Polish soldiers had fought in Italy on behalf of freedom and Poland's independence. Almost 150 years before Polish legions had fought for liberty and Poland in Napoleon's army under the leadership of General Dombrowski. In the mid-20th century they believed that, as in the 19th century, the fight for Polish independence would begin on the battlefields of Italy. Their zeal was heightened by the knowledge that on their performance would depend the Allied effort and the reputation of those freedom-loving Poles who were daily being slandered by the Soviet propaganda machine.

In May the Polish Army Corps was given the most difficult of the initial tasks in the Italian campaign—the capture of the German bastion of Monte Cassino, which had withstood time and again all attempts at seizure. So long as the sixth century benedictine abbey, now fortified by the Germans, held fast, the road to Rome and the success of the Italian campaign were blocked.

The first attack against Monte Cassino was launched on the 11th of May, on the 17th the second attack came, in the morning of May 18 the red and white flag of Poland was hoisted over the ruins of the abbey. The Polish Second Army Corps had captured one of the most stubborn German strongholds. Victory in Italy was now assured.

Without respite the Poles marched on to victory at Ancona, at Bologna, and in the Emilian Apennines. Those were proud days for the Second Army Corps and for all Poles, and yet the goal of national independence for which they were all fighting seemed as far away now as it had in the grim days of 1939. First at Teheran and then at Yalta Poland was sacrificed to the delusion that Russia could be appeased and her friendship secured by such concessions. Polish